

**Remarks/Arguments**

In the Response and Amendment filed December 22, 2004, claims 1-3, 9-11, 16, 18, and 19 were presented for consideration. In the Final Office Action dated March 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected all the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by one or more of the following references: *Tour Source*, *LeisureShopper*, U.S. Pat. No. 5,832,454 to Jafri et al.; PCT Appl. Ser. No. WO 97/176,680 to Tagawa; and U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,094 to Lynch et al. In response to the Final Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1, 9-11, 16, 18, and 19 as presently presented in view of the following remarks.

**Rejection of Independent Claim 1 Over *Tour Source* and *LeisureShopper*:**

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Tour Source* and *LeisureShopper* (the “Cited Systems”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s interpretation of the teachings of the Cited Systems and their application to claim 1. While the Cited Systems provide certain features to their users that facilitate the travel product reservation process, they do not function as a travel product inventory and rate management system as is recited in claim 1. Rather, the Cited Systems are designed to facilitate a travel agent’s ability to make bookings, not to provide management of inventory and rates according to rules established by the source of the particular travel products.

**Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 9, and 16 over U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,094 to Lynch:**

Independent claims 1, 9, and 16 (and the dependent claims which depend therefrom) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,094 to Lynch et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the broad interpretation given to Lynch and its application to the system of claim 1 and the methods of claims 9 and 16. Lynch discloses a system for identifying alternate low-cost travel arrangements by obtaining information from one or more computer reservation systems. In essence, it is an elaborate system for comparison shopping of competing offerings from a variety of travel product providers. In contrast, the system of claim 1 and the methods of claims 9 and 16 relate to a bulk inventory and rate management system.

Lynch is stated in the Office Action to disclose a “bulk inventory and rate database” in FIG. 1. However, FIG. 1 of Lynch discloses no such thing. Rather, FIG. 1 of Lynch shows how the Lynch system access the inventory information available from one or more third party computer reservation systems 24. Unlike the Lynch system, the system of claim 1 and methods of claims 9 and 16 include as a part of the system an inventory and rate management system with its own bulk inventory and rate database.

With respect to claim 9, the Office Action makes broad reference to Lynch as teaching the claimed loading of the bulk inventory and rate database with inventory and rate information for a plurality of travel products provided by a plurality of travel product suppliers. As described at column 6, lines 1-57, of Lynch, the Lynch procedure reflected in the flowchart of FIG. 3 reflects the updating of the Lynch system with current information about inventory that is available from third party providers. In contrast, the “loading” step in the method of claim 9 refers to the loading of the bulk inventory and rate database with inventory information relating

to the inventory of individual travel products of the operator the method. Thus, Lynch does not teach the “loading” step recited in claim 9.

In sum, Lynch fails to teach several elements recited in claims 1, 9, and 16. Because Lynch does not anticipate claims 1, 9, or 16, it does not anticipate the dependent claims which depend therefrom.

**Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 9-11, 16, 18, and 19 are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of same and notice of allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application and requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: B - Sept - 2005

By: Brian G. Gilpin

Brian G. Gilpin  
Registration No. 39,997

Attorneys of Record for the Applicant  
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.  
780 North Water Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590  
Phone: (414) 273-3500  
Facsimile: (414) 273-5198  
E-mail: bgilpin@gklaw.com